UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,779	02/08/2001	Jean M. Goldschmidt Iki	42390P6482D	6746

7590 08/04/2004

Gordon R. Lindeen III
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
NALEVANKO, CHRISTOPHER R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2611	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/779,779	GOLDSCHMIDT IKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher R Nalevanko	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 12, which is dependent on Claim 11, of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 1 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "receiving entertainment programming input" in Application Claim 1 equates to line 2 of Patent Claim 11, which Claim 12 is dependent upon. The claimed "identifying multiple available versions of an entertainment program" in Application Claim 1 equates to lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11. The claimed "identifying, for each of the multiple versions, a set of descriptive information regarding the respective version, the descriptive information having a plurality of characteristics" equates to lines 5-12 of Patent Claim 11. The claimed "selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of descriptive information and on a set of user preferences" equates to

lines 26-28 of Patent Claim 11 and lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12. Application Claim 1 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that Application Claim 1 is a broader recitation of the claimed elements in Patent Claim 12. Also, Application Claim 1 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that the Patent Claim is a system claim that could accomplish the method claim of Application Claim 1.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 2 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time from one another" in Application Claim 2 equates to lines 19-25 of Patent Claim 11.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 4 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "receiving a selection of an entertainment program and wherein identifying multiple versions comprises identifying alternate versions of the selected entertainment program" in Application Claim 4 equates to lines 3-4 and lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 5 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences" in Application Claim 5 equates to lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 6 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the most number of characteristics that conform to the set of user preferences" in Application Claim 6 equates to lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12. The claimed "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the most number of characteristics that conform to the set of user preferences" and "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences" are substantially equal limitations.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 7 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "set of descriptive information for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of channel transport medium, duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version" in Application Claim 7 equates to lines 5-12 of Patent Claim 11. Although Application Claim 7 differs from Patent Claim 11 with the additional limitations of channel transport medium and color code of the version, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention to include the added descriptive values to better match the user's request.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 9 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "identifying multiple versions comprises searching through data of an electronic programming guide" in Application Claim 9 equates to lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 12, which is dependent on Claim 11, of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 10 are

both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "receiving entertainment programming input" in Application Claim 10 equates to line 2 of Patent Claim 11, which Claim 12 is dependent upon. The claimed "identifying multiple available versions of an entertainment program" in Application Claim 10 equates to lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11. The claimed "identifying, for each of the multiple versions, a set of descriptive information regarding the respective version, the descriptive information having a plurality of characteristics" equates to lines 5-12 of Patent Claim 11. The claimed "selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of descriptive information and on a set of user preferences" equates to lines 26-28 of Patent Claim 11 and lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12. Application Claim 10 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that Application Claim 10 is a broader recitation of the claimed elements in Patent Claim 12. Also, Application Claim 10 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that the Patent Claim is a system claim that could perform the tasks of the storage medium having instructions and executed by a processor.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 11 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time from one another" in Application Claim 11 equates to lines 19-25 of Patent Claim 11.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 13 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "receiving a selection of an entertainment program and wherein identifying multiple versions comprises identifying alternate versions of the selected entertainment program" in Application Claim 13 equates to lines 3-4 and lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 14 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences" in Application Claim 14 equates to lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 15 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "set of descriptive information for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of channel

transport medium, duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version" in Application Claim 15 equates to lines 5-12 of Patent Claim 11. Although Application Claim 15 differs from Patent Claim 11 with the additional limitations of channel transport medium and color code of the version, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention to include the added descriptive values to better match the user's request.

13. Claim 16 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 12, which is dependent on Claim 11, of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 16 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "program guide controller to receive entertainment programming input" in Application Claim 16 equates to line 2 of Patent Claim 11, which Claim 12 is dependent upon. The claimed "selection controller coupled to the program guide controller to identify multiple available versions of an entertainment program, to identify, for each of the multiple versions, a set of descriptive information regarding the respective version, the descriptive information having a plurality of characteristics, and to select one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of descriptive information and on a set of user preferences" in Application Claim 16 equates to lines 15-25 of Patent Claim 11 and lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12. The claimed "a device controller, coupled to

the selection controller, to display the selected on of the multiple versions of the entertainment program" in Application Claim 16 equates to lines 26-28 of Patent Claim 11. Application Claim 16 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that Application Claim 16 is a broader recitation of the claimed elements in Patent Claim 12. Also, Application Claim 16 differs from Patent Claim 12 in that the Patent Claim is a system claim that corresponds to the apparatus of the Patent claim.

14. Claim 17 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 17 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "identifying multiple versions of the entertainment program that start within a threshold period of time from one another" in Application Claim 17 equates to lines 19-25 of Patent Claim 11.

15. Claim 19 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 19 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "select the one of the multiple versions having the set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences" in Application Claim 19 equates to lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12.

16. Claim 20 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 20 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "selects the one of the multiple versions having the most number of characteristics that conform to the set of user preferences" in Application Claim 20 equates to lines 1-6 of Patent Claim 12. The claimed "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the most number of characteristics that conform to the set of user preferences" and "selecting the one of the multiple versions having the set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences" are substantially equal limitations.

17. Claim 21 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,825. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Patent Claim 12 and application Claim 21 are both directed toward a system and method for selecting a version of multiple program occurrences. The claimed "set of descriptive information for each of the multiple versions includes one or more of duration of the version, type of audio support for the version, availability of enhanced programming for the version, language of subtitles in the version, language spoken in the version, screen format of the version, and color code of the version" in Application Claim 21 equates to lines 5-12 of Patent Claim 11. Although Application Claim 21 differs from Patent Claim 11 with the additional limitation color code of the version, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention to include the added descriptive values to better match the user's request.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski et al in further view of Rosser.

Regarding Claim 1, Wugofski shows a method comprising receiving entertainment programming input (col. 3 lines 1-26, 50-62, col. 4 lines 35-45), identifying multiple available versions of an entertainment program (col. 5 lines 1-35, fig. 4), identifying for each of the multiple versions a set of descriptive information regarding the respective version, the descriptive information having a plurality of characteristics (col. 5 lines 1-67), and selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of descriptive information (col. 5 lines 30-35, 55-67). Wugofski shows that module 310 stores information about media input devices, such as certain characteristics about each device (col. 5 lines 15-25). Wugofski shows information pertaining to the device name, if the device is tunable or not, and signal source (col. 5 lines 20-50). Although Wugofski shows setting parental control and "favorite places" (col. 4 lines 15-25), he fails to

specifically state using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content. Rosser shows using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content (col. 7 lines 45-57, col. 8 lines 20-65, col. 10 lines 20-35, col. 12 lines 1-20, 60-67, col. 13 lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Wugofski with the ability to select alternate content by user preferences in order to provide the user with a more customized stream of programming.

Regarding Claim 2, Wugofski shows that the entertainment programs start within a threshold period of time of one another (col. 5 lines 1-14, 50-67, fig. 4).

Regarding Claim 3, Wugofski shows that at least some of the multiple versions are provided on different transport media (col. 3 lines 1-26, col. 5 lines 1-67), the method further comprising identifying a set of descriptive information regarding the channel transport medium (col. 5 lines 1-15, 35-60), and wherein selecting comprises selecting one of the multiple versions for display based on the sets of channel transport medium descriptive information (col. 5 lines 35-67). Wugofski shows information pertaining to the device name, if the device is tunable or not, and signal source (col. 5 lines 20-50).

Regarding Claim 4, Wugofski shows receiving a selection of an entertainment program and identifying alternate versions of the selected entertainment program (col. 4 lines 35-50, col. 5 lines 1-15, 50-67, fig. 4).

Regarding Claim 5, Wugofski shows selecting from multiple versions (col. 5 lines 1-15, 50-67). Rosser shows selecting one of a multiple of content versions based on a set of descriptive information most closely resembling the set of user preferences (col. 8

lines 20-63, col. 12 lines 55-67, col. 13 lines 1-12, 35-45). Rosser shows using algorithms and vectors to give the user the best matched content.

Regarding Claim 6, the limitations of the claim are substantially the same as Claim 5.

Regarding Claim 7, Wugofski shows that the set of descriptive information includes channel transport medium (fig. 4). Wugofski shows information pertaining to the device name, if the device is tunable or not, and signal source (col. 5 lines 20-50).

Regarding Claim 8, Rosser shows identifying a user of an entertainment system (col. 15 lines 5-28), accessing user preferences for the identified user (col. 15 lines 28), and selecting content from versions of content based on a comparison of the sets of descriptive information (col. 14 lines 50-60).

Regarding Claim 9, Wugofski shows searching through data of an electronic programming guide (col. 4 lines 35-67, col. 5 lines 1-15).

Regarding Claim 10, Wugofski shows a computer for controlling the system, which contains a storage medium having stored a plurality of instructions (col. 3 lines 45-67, col. 4 lines 1-33, fig. 2). The remaining limitations have been discussed with regards to the method claim of Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 11, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 2.

Regarding Claim 12, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 3.

Regarding Claim 13, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 4.

Regarding Claim 14, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 5.

Regarding Claim 15, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 16, Wugofski shows a program guide controller to receive entertainment programming input (col. 3 lines 1-45, col. 4 lines 35-67), a selection controller coupled to the program guide controller to identify multiple versions of a program, to identify a set of descriptive information regarding the respective version, the descriptive information having a plurality of characteristics, and to select one of the multiple version for display based on the sets of descriptive information (col. 5 lines 1-67). Wugofski shows that module 310 stores information about media input devices, such as certain characteristics about each device (col. 5 lines 15-25). Wugofski shows information pertaining to the device name, if the device is tunable or not, and signal source (col. 5 lines 20-50). Wugofski also shows a device controller to display the selected version of the program (col. 3 lines 29-44, col. 4 lines 15-33). Although Wugofski shows setting parental control and "favorite places" (col. 4 lines 15-25), he fails to specifically state using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content. Rosser shows using a set of user preferences to select one of multiple versions of content (col. 7 lines 45-57, col. 8 lines 20-65, col. 10 lines 20-35, col. 12 lines 1-20, 60-67, col. 13 lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Wugofski with the ability to select alternate content by user preferences in order to provide the user with a more customized stream of programming.

Regarding Claim 17, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 2.

Regarding Claim 18, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 3.

Regarding Claim 19, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 5.

Regarding Claim 20, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 6.

Regarding Claim 21, the limitations of the claim have been discussed with regards to Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 22, Wugofski shows the ability of the user to manually input parental controls, which are preferences (col. 4 lines 22-25).

Regarding Claim 23, Rosser shows determining the user preferences by monitoring the behavior of the user (col. 8 lines 1-55, col. 9 lines 50-67, col. 12 lines 1-35).

Regarding Claim 24, Rosser shows identifying a particular user and applying user preferences for the identified user (col. 15 lines 5-30).

Regarding Claim 25, Wugofski shows a user interface that allows the user to manually input parental controls, which are preferences (col. 4 lines 8-33).

Regarding Claim 26, Rosser shows determining the user preferences by monitoring the behavior of the user (col. 8 lines 1-55, col. 9 lines 50-67, col. 12 lines 1-35).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reimer et al U.S. Patent No. 5,559,949 discloses a computer program product and program storage device for linking and presenting movies with their underlying source information.

Ford U.S. Patent No. 6,519,770 discloses a system for filtering content from videos.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R Nalevanko whose telephone number is 703-305-8093. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher Nalevanko
AU 2611
703-305-8093

cn

CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER